DRAFT

December __, 1989

AIR MAIL

Mr. John H. Bass
Reddie & Grose
16 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8PL
ENGLAND

Re: Bulgarian Pat. Appln. No. 89276
Your File: 30591
Our File: PM-1322 (Bulgaria)

Dear John:

I have reviewed the official letter enclosed with your November 21, 1989 letter. I agree with you that the letter is probably a standard first official letter, and that the present specification already meets most of the points listed. I also agree with your interpretation of "static disclosure", based on the second sentence of paragraph 1 of the official letter.

As to paragraph 1, the patent numbers were omitted because we understood that their inclusion would raise objections in many countries. In any event, the "one previous attempt" of page 1, line 3, is Siegel U.S. Patent 2,907,686. "Another smoking article" of page 1, line 22, is Ellis et al. U.S. Patent 3,258,015. (The reference to Ellis 3,356,094 at page 2, lines 9-10, was actually left in unintentionally.) The "third smoking article" of page 2, line 7, is Europe 0 177 355. The "fourth smoking article" of page 2, line 18, is Banerjee et al. U.S. Patent 4,714,082 (copy enclosed), which, as you suggest, is a Reynolds patent.

2020048864

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xpfj0000

A "static description" of Banerjee is as follows:

> Banerjee shows a cigarette-type smoking article comprising a combustible fuel element in conductive heat-exchange relationship with a physically separate aerosol generating means. This relationship is said to be achieved by direct contact between the fuel element and the aerosol generating means and by a metallic heat conductor in contact with both the fuel element and the aerosol generating means.

This description is nearly identical to a description included in an Information Disclosure Statement in the corresponding U.S. case.

As to paragraph 2 (and the last sentence of paragraph 1), I believe the application at page 2, line 28 to page 3, line 13, meets the stated requirements.

As to paragraph 3, there is a "statement of invention" at page 3, line 26 to page 4, line 19, which paraphrases existing claim 1. If claim 1 is changed, this paragraph should be changed accordingly.

As to paragraph 4, your suggestion seems acceptable, but it appears to me that a statement of advantages already appears at page 3, lines 15-25, except that they are characterized as "objects".

As to paragraph 5, I agree that the present disclosure should already meet this requirement.

As to paragraph 6, your suggested claims appear to be acceptable.

As to paragraph 7, in addition to rearranging the existing abstract, I believe some "static disclosure" from claim 1 should be added.

Please provide a copy of your proposed response for our review before filing.

Very truly yours,

JHI:bas
Enc.

Jeffrey H. Ingerman

cc: Ms. Beverly A. Monroe (w/o enc.)

2020048865

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xpfj0000